



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,936	04/03/2001	Jacques Schmitt	H37-091 DIV	9938

21706 7590 01/29/2004

NOTARO AND MICHALOS
100 DUTCH HILL ROAD
SUITE 110
ORANGEBURG, NY 10962-2100

EXAMINER

CROWELL, ANNA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1763

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/824,936

Applicant(s)

SCHMITT, JACQUES

Examiner

Michelle Crowell

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2 and 9-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 10/27/03 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Species I, Figure 2, claims 1-8 in Paper No. 5 is acknowledged. Additionally, claim 2 is withdrawn because it is directed to Species 6-Figure 10.

Specification

2. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

Claim 1 recites, "at least one substrate with a largest dimension of at least 0.7m". On page 6, lines 5-11 of the specification, a general discussion of substrate sizes for most processing plasmas is given; however, the specification does not positively recite the dimension or size of the substrate for applicant's claimed invention. Note. Cancelled claim 14 supports the new limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1763

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1 and 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanada (Japanese Patent Publication 08-186094) in view of Shang et al. (U.S. 6,177,023) and Collins et al. (U.S. 5,210,466).

Referring to Drawings 1 and 2 and the abstract, Hanada discloses a capacitively coupled radio frequency plasma reactor 19 comprising: at least two electrically conductive electrodes 12 and 21 spaced from each other, each electrode having an external surface, an internal process space 11 enclosed between the electrodes, a gas providing means 16 for providing the internal process space with a reactive gas, at least one radio frequency generator 29 connected to at least one of the electrodes, at a connection location, for generating a plasma discharge in the process space, a means 26 to evacuate the reactive gas from the reactor, at least one substrate 1 defining one limit of the internal process space, to be exposed to the processing action of the plasma discharge, the at least one substrate extends along a general surface and is arranged between the electrodes, at least one dielectric layer 21a extending outside the internal process space, the dielectric layer being a capacitor that is electrically in series with the substrate and the plasma, and the dielectric layer having a capacitance per unit surface values which are not uniform along

Art Unit: 1763

at least one direction of the general surface, for generating a given distribution profile, especially for compensating a process non uniformity in the reactor.

Hanada fails to teach a radio frequency generator for frequencies greater than 13.56 MHz.

Referring to column 4, lines 26-47, Collins et al. discloses a capacitively coupled radio frequency plasma reactor using a radio frequency generator which applies frequencies greater than 13.56 MHz (50-800 MHz) since higher frequencies provide commercially viable processing rates and substantial reduction in sheath voltages. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the radio frequency generator of Hanada to apply frequencies greater than 13.56 MHz as taught by Collins et al. since higher frequencies provide commercially viable processing rates and substantial reduction in sheath voltages.

Hanada fails to teach at least one substrate with a largest dimension of at least 0.7m.

Referring to column 5, lines 58-63, Shang et al. teaches a plasma reactor for processing a substrate with a largest dimension up to 1m. It is well known in the art to scale up or down an apparatus to accommodate the desired substrate size. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the apparatus of Hanada with a substrate having a largest dimension up to 1m since it is well known in the art to scale up or down an apparatus to accommodate the desired substrate size. Additionally, where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device (In *Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984),

cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984)).

With respect to claim 3, the dielectric layer 21a has a thickness "a" along a direction perpendicular to the general surface of the substrate 1, the thickness being non uniform along the dielectric layer, so that the reactor has a location-dependent capacitance per unit surface values along the general surface (Fig. 2 and abstract).

With respect to claim 4, the dielectric layer 21a is the thickest in front of the location in the process space 11 which is the furthest away from the connection location where the radio frequency generator 29 is connected to the at least one electrode and the thickness decreases from the process space location as the distance between the process space location and the connection location on the corresponding electrode decreases (Fig. 1 and abstract).

With respect to claim 5, the dielectric layer 21a has at least one non planar-shaped external surface (Fig. 2 and abstract).

With respect to claim 6, at least one of the electrodes 21 has a non planar-shaped surface facing the substrate 1 (Figs. 1 and 2).

With respect to claim 7, the dielectric layer 21a is locally delimited by a surface of one of the electrodes 21, and the delimitation surface of the one electrode is curved (Fig. 1 and 2).

With respect to claim 8, the dielectric layer comprises a solid dielectric layer (Figs. 1, 2 and abstract).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 1763

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Gegenwart et al. teaches a plasma apparatus for processing large substrates having dimensions of 1m by 1m.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michelle Crowell whose telephone number is (571) 272-1432.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 - 4:30).

Art Unit: 1763

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Mills can be reached on (571) 272-1439. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

AMC *ame*


GREGORY MILLS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700